

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 10-12 are pending. The support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in the published specification at [0033] and claim 12 is the same as claim 1 except for the transition phrase. No new matter has been entered and no new issue has been raised, as the previously claimed range has merely been clarified to a blend nowhere disclosed in the art.

Claims 1-4, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. (Office Action, page 2)

Claim 1 has been corrected based on the disclosure in the published specification at [0033].

Claims 1-4, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. (Office Action, page 3)

Claim 1 has been corrected based on the disclosure in the published specification at [0033].

Claims 1-4, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001139768 in view of JP 01229064 A. (Office Action page 3)

Again, as shown in the following table, the upper limit of the blending amount of the inorganic filler of JP'768 is 500 parts by mass per 100 parts by mass of phenol resin.

		blending amount [parts]	calculated blending amount [parts by mass]
phenol resin	(a)	10-40	—
	(b)	5-35	—
	total	15-75	100
tc/bisoxamethylene tetramine		2-10	—
(inorganic filler	total	45-75	$85(45/53^*) \div 500(75/15)$
	wollastonite	35-65	$66(35/53^*) \div 433(65/15)$
	glass fiber	5-35	$14(5/53^*) \div 233(35/15)$
	clay	5-35	—
	total	100	—

Further, the phenol novolak (a)(b) of JP'768 is different from the phenolic novolak used in this application, because its Mw is higher, and JP'768 does not disclose a degree of dispersion (Mw/Mn) of the phenolic novolak (a)(b).

In combination with JP'064, the claimed invention is still not taught, as explained above.

The phenolic resin molding material of this invention has outstanding abrasion resistance and thermal shock property (See [0054]-[0062] and Comparative Example 3). Such properties, due in part to the claimed range, are not suggested by the combination of the art, especially because the ***disclosed ranges do not overlap.***

In light of the clear ***chemical differences*** over the art, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Since the applicants have merely clarified the claimed range, it is believed that no new issue is raised by the claim amendment and no further search is required.

Claims 1-4, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 01229064 A in view of JP 2001139768. (Office Action page 5)

JP' 064 only discloses general inorganic fibrous fillers, and does not disclose the specific combination of wollastonite and glass fiber and their ***advantageous blending amount.***

The rejection alleges,

JP'064 further teaches employing a mixture of various fibers including wollastonite and glass fibers, and examples show employing total 75 vol. % of fillers.

But, barium sulfate, alumina, cashew dust, and graphite are not fibrous filler. Though steel fiber is inorganic fibrous filler (it is not wollastonite and glass fiber), its blending amount is ***1580 parts by mass per 100 parts by mass of resin*** (specific gravity of steel fiber is about 7.9 g/cm^3 , specific gravity of novolak phenol resin is about 1.25 g/cm^3). This is ***chemically different*** than the invention as now claimed blending ***600 to 900 parts by mass total of an inorganic fibrous filler with 100 parts by mass of a phenolic novolak.***

As discussed above, the upper limit of the blending amount of the inorganic filler of JP768 is **500 parts by mass per 100 parts by mass of phenol resin**, which is also chemically different from claimed invention, among other reasons.

Therefore the combination of references fail to create a *prima facie* rejection of obviousness over the invention as now claimed, because the blending amounts disclosed in the art do not overlap. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Dated: September 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 21874

Electronic signature: /James E. Armstrong, IV/
James E. Armstrong, IV
Registration No.: 42,266
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(202) 478-7375
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant